

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, then I will ask for a second question with the indulgence of the Senator. With all due respect, the answer is a nonanswer. It doesn't tell us when we might consider these nominees. The distinguished assistant majority leader said phrases such as "as quickly as possible" and "as rapidly as we can accommodate." Is it not true that there are 15—if I am incorrect, please give the correct number—15 people pending on the Executive Calendar who don't await anything except our action? We can do it now or at the end of the day. Nothing stands in the way—no committee chairmen, no further vote, nothing. As far as I know, there is no controversy with respect to any of these.

Is there any reason that this number, whether it be 14 or 15, could not be agreed to today?

Mr. REID. We hope before the day's end there are more than that on the calendar. Some will be reported today.

This is not quite as easy as the Senator from Arizona has indicated. The Department of the Treasury—these four people who have been reported out by the committee, by Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS, are really important, we think—the Deputy Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Under Secretary, and another Under Secretary. These are being held up on your side. We are trying to work our way through this. I say to my friend that we are trying to do our best. We are acting in good faith. That is why we interrupted the proceedings for Mr. Schieffer.

Senator NICKLES and I have been given an assignment. I know you will accept what I say. He and I have been working hard, but I ask you to meet with him. We have had a number of discussions relating to the nominations. I am confident it is going to bear fruit very quickly.

Mr. KYL. I will not object. I appreciate the response of the assistant majority leader, although it suggests to me that these nominees are being held hostage to the legislative process. I hope we can get these confirmations as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the confirmation?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination was confirmed.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for his remaining 9 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and the assistant majority leader for his courtesy. I want to conclude by commenting once again on

the importance of the United States keeping its international commitment, a commitment made to Canada and Mexico to allow a free trade area to occur on the North American continent. It is in our own interest. It is the intelligent thing to do, and historically it will see to it that the economies of all three of these countries will benefit.

Here is the first test we have of whether or not the actual regulations of NAFTA will be allowed to work in a way that benefits our neighbors to the south, even though it discomfits a powerful political group in the United States. If we fail that test, we will send a message to the Mexicans that says we didn't really mean it; we don't think you really should have equal status with the Americans. I can think of no more corrosive a message to send to the Mexicans than that one. That is why I think we must be as firm as we are trying to be in this debate of making it clear that we are going to hang on to this issue until it is resolved satisfactorily.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, it is not often we get an opportunity to have someone speak in the Senate who has built a successful business, who has been engaged in international commerce, who has negotiated contracts for millions of dollars. I would like to take this opportunity, since he has a few minutes left, to pose some questions to the Senator about the debate before us.

As the Senator is aware, we entered into a free trade agreement with Canada and Mexico in 1994. A Republican President signed the agreement in San Antonio, TX—George Bush. The agreement was ratified with the vigorous support of a Democrat President, Bill Clinton. We are in the process of implementing it under another Republican President. So this is an agreement that was supported on a bipartisan basis by three Presidents.

In that agreement, in the section having to do with the question before us, we have chapter 12, which is on cross-border trade and services. The language of the trade agreement is very simple. I would like to read it to you, and I would like to ask you some questions.

First of all, the language says very simply what America's obligation is under what it calls "national treatment." It is very simple. Our obligation to Canada, our obligation to Mexico, and their obligation to us is the following:

Each party shall accord to service providers of another party treatment no less favorable than that it accords in like circumstances to its own service providers.

First of all, with regard to trucking companies, if you had to convert that legal statement of obligation into English, what do you think it would say?

Mr. BENNETT. I say to the Senator from Texas, I think it would say that Mexican trucks coming into the United States, Canadian trucks coming into the United States, or American trucks going into Mexico would all have to comply with the requirements of the States in which they were operating, but that in the process of thus complying, they would not have to change their procedures to a situation different from the procedures that were considered acceptable on both sides.

This is something that would require the Americans to say we will honor the Mexican Government's procedures just as we expect the Mexican Government to honor the American Government's procedures.

Mr. GRAMM. We would treat them the same. Whatever requirement we would have, they would have.

Mr. BENNETT. I say to the Senator, that would be my understanding of the part of the treaty which he has read.

Mr. GRAMM. Let me raise some issues in the time we have and see if the Senator believes that these issues violate the provision.

The Murray amendment says that under the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999, which we adopted and which has to do with motor safety in America, in general, Canadian trucks can operate in America. Let me explain the problem.

We have not yet implemented this law. Under President Clinton and now under President Bush, the difficulty in writing the regulations this bill calls for are so substantial that the provisions of this law have not yet been implemented.

Even though they have not yet been implemented, a thousand Canadian trucks are operating in the United States under the same regulations American trucks are operating. Many thousands of American trucks are operating. But under the Murray amendment, until the regulations for this law are written and implemented, no Mexican trucks can operate in the United States on an interstate commerce basis.

Would the Senator view that to be equal treatment?

Mr. BENNETT. I would not, and I say to the Senator from Texas that I am familiar with the American legislation to which he refers because I have had, as I suppose the Senator from Texas has had, considerable complaints from my constituents about the regulations proposed under that bill and have contacted the administration, both the previous one and the present one, to say: Don't implement all aspects of this bill until you look at the specifics of these regulations; some of the things you are asking for in this bill would, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the constituents who have contacted me, make the American highways less safe than they are now.

To say we must wait until that is done before we allow Mexican trucks